

ON THE COMPUTATION OF RATLIFF-RUSH CLOSURE

JUAN ELIAS *

ABSTRACT. Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring with maximal ideal $\mathbf{m}$. In this paper we present a procedure for computing the Ratliff-Rush closure of a $\mathbf{m}$ -primary ideal $I \subset R$.

INTRODUCTION

Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay Noetherian local ring of dimension $d \geq 1$ with maximal ideal $\mathbf{m}$ and residue field $\mathbf{k}$ that we may assume infinite. Given a $\mathbf{m}$ -primary ideal $I \subset R$ in [5] the Ratliff-Rush closure of I is defined by $\tilde{I} = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} (I^{k+1} : I^k)$, and it holds that

$$\tilde{I} = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} (I^{k+1} : (x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k))$$

where $x_1, \dots, x_d$ is a minimal reduction of I .

Although Ratliff-Rush behaves bad under most of the basic operations of commutative algebra it is a basic tool in the study of the Hilbert functions of primary ideals, see for example [6] and its reference list.

Shah defined in [8] a finite chain of ideals between I and its integral closure $\bar{I}$

$$I \subset I_{[d]} \subset \dots \subset I_{[1]} \subset \bar{I}$$

$I_{[i]}$ is the i -coefficient ideal of I , and $I_{[d]} = \tilde{I}$ the Ratliff-Rush closure of I . Few results are known about the explicit computation of coefficient ideals. Ciupercă in [4] computed the first coefficient ideal of an ideal $I \subset R$, R is an (S_2) ring, by considering the S_2 -ification of the extended Rees algebra of I .

The aim of this paper is to present an algorithm for the computation of Ratliff-Rush closure. In the first section we prove some results on superficial sequences that enable us to describe, in the section two, an algorithm to compute Ratliff-Rush closure. We end the paper with some explicit computations of the Ratliff-Rush closure of ideals using the algorithm of this paper.

Date: February 1, 2008.

*Partially supported by DGICYT BFM2001-3584, and Commutative Algebra program of the MSRI, Berkeley.
2000 MSC: 13P10, 13H15, 13H10.

We will use freely [2] as a general reference for the algebraic concepts appearing in this paper. The computations of this paper are performed by using CoCoA, [3].

We thank Ciupercă for the useful comments on a previous version of this paper. We also thank M.E. Rossi and W. Vasconcelos for pointing us that [7, Corollary 3.4] holds also for $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideals.

1. ON SUPERFICIAL SEQUENCES

Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of R . We denote by $gr_I(R) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} I^k / I^{k+1}$ the associated graded ring of I , and by $l(I)$ the analytic spread of I .

Let $h_I(n) = \text{length}_R(R/I^{n+1})$ be the Hilbert-Samuel function of I , $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence there exist integers $e_j(I) \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$p_I(X) = \sum_{j=0}^d (-1)^j e_j(I) \binom{X+d-j}{d-j}$$

is the Hilbert-Samuel polynomial of I , i.e. $h_I(n) = p_I(n)$ for $n \gg 0$. The integer $e_j(I)$ is the j -th Hilbert coefficient of I , $j = 0, \dots, d$. Shah proved that coefficient ideals are the largest ideals $I_{[t]}$ containing I and such that:

- (i) $e_i(I) = e_i(I_{[t]})$ for $i = 0, \dots, t$,
- (ii) $I \subset I_{[d]} \subset \dots \subset I_{[1]} \subset \bar{I}$

where $\bar{I}$ is the integral closure of I , [8]. Notice that $\tilde{I}$ is the largest ideal containing I and such that $e_i(I) = e_i(\tilde{I})$ for $i = 0, \dots, d$.

We say that $x \in I$ is a superficial element of I if there exists an integer k_0 such that $(I^{k+1} : x) = I^k$ for $k \geq k_0$. Since the residue field is infinite it hold:

- (1) a set elements $x_1, \dots, x_d \in I$, such that their cosets $\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_d \in I/\mathfrak{m}I$ are generic, form a superficial sequence $x_1, \dots, x_d$ of I , i.e. x_i is a superficial element of $I/(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$,
- (2) if $x_1, \dots, x_d \in I$ is a set of elements such that

$$\text{length}_R \left(\frac{R}{(x_1, \dots, x_d)} \right) = e_0(I),$$

where $e_0(I)$ is the multiplicity of I , then $x_1, \dots, x_d$ a superficial sequence of the ideal I ,

- (3) if $x_1, \dots, x_d$ is a superficial sequence of I then $J = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is a minimal reduction of I , [9].

Given a superficial element x of I if we write $\bar{I} = I/(x)$ then it is well known that

$$p_{\bar{I}}(X) = p_I(X) - p_I(X-1) = \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} (-1)^j e_j(I) \binom{X+d-2-j}{d-1-j}$$

in particular $e_i(\bar{I}) = e_i(I)$ for $i = 0, \dots, d-1$. We define the postulation number $pn(I)$ of I as the smallest integer n such that $h_I(t) = p_I(t)$ for all $t \geq n$. Given a superficial sequence $x_1, \dots, x_d$ of I we denote by $pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d)$ the maximum among $pn(I)$ and $pn(I/(x_i))$, $i = 1, \dots, d$.

Proposition 1.1. *Let I be a $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of R and x a superficial element of I . We denote by $\bar{I} = I/(x)$ the ideal of $\bar{R} = R/(x)$. For all $k \geq pn(I; x) + 1$ it holds*

$$(I^{k+1} : x) = I^k.$$

Proof. Let us consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \frac{(I^{k+1} : x)}{I^k} \longrightarrow \frac{R}{I^k} \xrightarrow{\cdot x} \frac{R}{I^{k+1}} \longrightarrow \frac{\bar{R}}{\bar{I}^{k+1}} \longrightarrow 0,$$

so

$$\text{length}_R \left(\frac{(I^{k+1} : x)}{I^k} \right) = h_I(k-1) - h_I(k) + h_{\bar{I}}(k).$$

If $k \geq pn(I; x) + 1$ then we have that $h_I(k) = p_I(k)$, $h_I(k-1) = p_I(k-1)$ and $h_{\bar{I}}(k) = p_{\bar{I}}(k)$, so

$$\text{length}_R \left(\frac{(I^{k+1} : x)}{I^k} \right) = p_I(k-1) - p_I(k) + p_{\bar{I}}(k).$$

On the other hand, since x is a superficial element of I we have that $p_{\bar{I}}(X) = p_I(X) - p_I(X-1)$ then $(I^{k+1} : x) = I^k$ for all $k \geq pn(I; x) + 1$. $\square$

Notice that for the explicit computations of coefficient ideals it is enough to consider the number $pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d)$, Theorem 2.1 (i), but if we look for a explicit formula of the Ratliff-Rush closure avoiding the computation of superficial sequences we have to consider the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity, Theorem 2.1 (ii).

Given a standard A_0 -algebra $A = A_0 \oplus A_1 \oplus \dots$ with A_0 an Artin ring, we denote by $\text{reg}(A)$ the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of A , i.e. the smallest integer m such that $H_{A_+}^i(A)_n = 0$ for all $i = 0, \dots, d$ and $n \geq m - i + 1$, where $A_+ = A_1 \oplus \dots$ the irrelevant ideal of A .

We denote by $f : \mathbb{N}^2 \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ the numerical function defined by

$$f(e, d) = \begin{cases} e - 1 & \text{if } d = 1 \\ e^{2(d-1)!-1} (e-1)^{(d-1)!} & \text{if } d \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

Rossi, Trung and Valla prove that $f(e, d)$ is an upper bound of the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of the associated graded ring of I , see Proposition 1.2.

Given a minimal reduction J of I we denote by $r_J(I)$ the reduction number of I with respect to I , i.e. the smallest integer r such that $I^{r+1} = JI^r$.

In the next result we relate some of the numerical characters that we already defined in this paper.

Proposition 1.2. *Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring of dimension $d \geq 1$. Let I be a $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of R and $J = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ a minimal reduction of I . Then*

- (i) $r_J(I) \leq \text{reg}(gr_I(R)) \leq f(e_0(I), d)$, and
- (ii) $pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d) \leq f(e_0(I), d) + 1$.

Proof. (i) The first inequality comes from [10, Proposition 3.2], see also [1, Theorem 18.3.12]. The second inequality is due to Rossi, Trung and Valla, [7, Corollary 3.4]. (ii) Notice that from Serre's formula, [2, Theorem 4.4.3], and the right hand side inequality in (i) we have that $pn(I) \leq f(e_0(I), d) + 1$ and $pn(I/(x_i)) \leq f(e_0(I/(x_i)), d - 1) + 1$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. Since $e_0(I) = e_0(I/(x_i))$ and $f(e, d - 1) \leq f(e, d)$, we get the claim. $\square$

Notice that in [7, Corollary 3.4] the right hand side inequality in (i) of the above result is proved for the maximal ideal $I = \mathfrak{m}$, but the proof holds also for general $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideals.

Corollary 1.3. *Let x be a superficial element of I . For all $k \geq f(e_0(I), d) + 2$ we have*

$$(I^{k+1} : x) = I^k.$$

Proof. It is a consequence of Proposition 1.2 (ii) and Proposition 1.1. $\square$

2. AN ALGORITHM FOR COMPUTING RATLIFF-RUSH CLOSURE

In this section we compute explicitly Ratliff-Rush closure by using Proposition 1.1 and Corollary 1.3. We consider the increasing ideal chain

$$\mathcal{L}_1 \subset \mathcal{L}_2 \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{L}_k \subset \dots$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_k = (I^{k+1} : (x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k)).$$

Notice that $\tilde{I} = \bigcup_{k \geq 1} \mathcal{L}_k$ is the Ratliff-Rush closure of I .

Theorem 2.1. *Let R be a Cohen-Macaulay local ring of dimension $d \geq 1$. Let I be an $\mathfrak{m}$ -primary ideal of R and let $x_1, \dots, x_d$ be a superficial sequence of I .*

- (i) *For all $k \geq pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d) + 1$ it holds that*

$$\tilde{I} = (I^{k+1} : (x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k)).$$

(ii) For all $k \geq (d+1)(f(e_0(I)) + 2)$ it holds that

$$\tilde{I} = (I^{k+1} : I^k).$$

Proof. (i) We have to prove that for all $k \geq pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d) + 1$ it holds $\mathcal{L}_k = \mathcal{L}_{k+1}$. Notice that for all $n \geq 1$ we have $\mathcal{L}_n \subset \mathcal{L}_{n+1}$ so we only need to prove $\mathcal{L}_{k+1} \subset \mathcal{L}_k$. Given $a \in \mathcal{L}_{k+1}$ we have $ax_i^{k+1} = x_i(ax_i^k) \in I^{k+2}$, for all $i = 1, \dots, d$. Since $k \geq pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d) + 1$ from Proposition 1.1 we get $ax_i^k \in I^{k+1}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, d$, so $a \in \mathcal{L}_k$.

(ii) Notice that $J = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is a minimal reduction of I so for all $k \geq r_J(I)$

$$I^{(d+1)k} = I^{dk}(x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k).$$

From Proposition 1.2 we have that $r_J(I) \leq \text{reg}(gr_I(R)) \leq f(e_0(I), d)$. Let $n \geq f(e_0(I), d) + 2$ be an integer and let $a \in \tilde{I}$ be an element of the Ratliff-Rush closure of I . Hence from (i) we have $ax^{[k]} \subset I^{k+1}$ and since $I^{(d+1)k} = I^{dk}(x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k)$ we get

$$aI^{(d+1)k} \subset aI^{dk}(x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k) \subset I^{(d+1)k+1}.$$

In particular we have $a \in (I^{(d+1)k+1} : I^{(d+1)k})$, since by definition $(I^{(d+1)k+1} : I^{(d+1)k}) \subset \tilde{I}$ we get the claim. $\square$

From the last result we deduce that the problem of computing the Ratliff-Rush closure can be reduced to the computation of the postulation number of I and its quotients $I/(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, d$. Next we recall how to compute these numbers.

We denote by $PS_I(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[[X]]$ the Poincaré series of I

$$PS_I(X) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \text{length}_R \left(\frac{I^i}{I^{i+1}} \right) X^i$$

it is known that there exists a degree s polynomial $f(X) = \sum_{i=0}^s a_i X^i \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ such that

$$PS_I(X) = \frac{f(X)}{(1-X)^d}.$$

It is easy to prove that $e_0(I) = \sum_{i=0}^s a_i$ and that $pn(I) = s - d$.

Remark 2.2. It is well known that the computation of the Poincaré series of I and its quotients $I/(x_i)$ can be reduced to a elimination of variables process, see for example the library `primary.lib` of CoCoA, [3].

AN ALGORITHM FOR COMPUTING THE RATLIFF-RUSH CLOSURE.

Step 1. Compute the Poincaré series of I . Then we know the multiplicity $e_0(I)$ and the postulation number $pn(I)$ of I .

Step 2. Find d generic elements $x_1, \dots, x_d$ of the $\mathbf{k}$ -vector space $I/\mathbf{m}I$ such that $\text{length}_R(R/(x_1, \dots, x_d)) = e_0(I)$. Recall that $x_1, \dots, x_d$ is a superficial sequence of I and generates a minimal reduction of I .

Step 3. As in **Step 1** compute $PS_{I/(x_i)} = f_i(X)/(1-X)^{d-1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$. From this and the fact $pn(I/(x_i)) = \deg(f_i) - (d-1)$ we can compute $pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d)$.

Step 4. For $k \geq pn(I; x_1, \dots, x_d) + 1$ we get

$$\tilde{I} = (I^{k+1} : (x_1^k, \dots, x_d^k)).$$

Remark 2.3. Notice that if I is a monomial ideal then **Step 4** can be performed without Gröbner basis computation.

We will show how to compute the Ratliff-Rush closure in some explicit examples of [4] and [6].

Example 2.4. Example 1.10 of [6]. Let $I = (x^{10}, y^5, xy^4, x^8y)$ be an ideal of $R = \mathbf{k}[x, y]_{(x, y)}$. The Poincaré series of I is

$$PS_I(X) = \frac{35 + 4X + 4X^2 + 4X^3 - 2X^4}{(1-X)^2},$$

so $e_0(I) = 45$ and $pn(I) = 2$. Since the length of $R/(y^5 + x^{10} + x^8y, xy^4)$ is $45 = e_0(I)$ we deduce that $y^5 + x^{10} + x^8y, xy^4$ is a superficial sequence of I . A CoCoA computation shows that

$$PS_{I/(xy^4)}(X) = \frac{35 + 6X + 2X^2 + 2X^3}{1-X},$$

and

$$PS_{I/(y^5 + x^{10} + x^8y)}(X) = \frac{35 + 6X + 4X^2}{1-X},$$

so $pn(I; y^5 + x^{10} + x^8y, xy^4) = 2$. Then by Theorem 2.1 (i) we get

$$I \subsetneq \tilde{I} = (I^4 : ((y^5 + x^{10} + x^8y)^3, (xy^4)^3)) = (x^{10}, y^5, xy^4, x^7y^2, x^6y^3, x^8y).$$

Remark 2.5. Let $x_1 = y^5 + x^{10} + x^8y, x_2 = xy^4$ be the minimal reduction of the ideal I of the last example. Since $pn(I; x_1, x_2) = 2$ we have that $\tilde{I} = (I^4 : (x_1^3, x_2^3))$. On the other hand, Theorem 2.1 (ii) gives that $\tilde{I} = (I^{k+1} : I^k)$ for all $k \geq 540$, this is a hard computation.

Example 2.6. Example 1.4 of [6]. Let us consider the ideal

$$I = (y^{22}, x^4y^{18}, x^7y^{15}, x^8y^{14}, x^{11}y^{11}, x^{14}y^8, x^{15}y^7, x^{18}y^4, x^{22})$$

of the local ring $R = \mathbf{k}[x, y]_{(x, y)}$. A similar computation as we did in the previous example shows that $I = \tilde{I}$ and

$$I^2 \subsetneq \tilde{I}^2 = I^2 + (x^{24}y^{20}, x^{20}y^{24}).$$

Example 2.7. Example 3.3 of [4]. Let us consider the ideal

$$I = (x^8, x^3y^2, x^2y^4, y^8)$$

of the local ring $R = \mathbf{k}[x, y]_{(x, y)}$. A similar computation as before shows that $I = \tilde{I}$. Ciuperca in [4] computed the first coefficient ideal of I :

$$I = \tilde{I} \subsetneq I_{[1]} = (x^8, x^3y^2, x^2y^4, xy^6, y^8).$$

REFERENCES

- [1] M.P. Brodman and R.Y. Sharp. *Local Cohomology*, volume 60 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [2] W. Bruns and J. Herzog. *Cohen-Macaulay Rings*. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [3] A. Capani, G. Niesi, and L. Robbiano. *CoCoA, a system for doing Computations in Commutative Algebra*. Available via anonymous ftp from `cocoa.dima.unige.it`, 4.0 edition, 2000.
- [4] C. Ciuperca. First coefficient ideals and the S_2 -ification of a Rees algebra. *J. of Alg.*, 242:782–794, 2001.
- [5] L. Ratliff and D. Rush. Two notes on reductions of ideals. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 27:929–934, 1978.
- [6] M. E. Rossi and I. Swanson. Notes on the behaviour of the Ratliff-Rush filtration. *Preprint*, 2002.
- [7] M.E. Rossi, N.V. Trung, and G. Valla. Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity and extended degree. *Preprint*, 2002.
- [8] K. Shah. Coefficient ideals. *Trans. A.M.S.*, 327(1):373–384, 1991.
- [9] I. Swanson. A note on analytic spread. *Comm. in Algebra*, 22:407–411, 1994.
- [10] N.V. Trung. Reduction exponent and degree bound for the defining equations of graded rings. *Proc. A.M.S.*, 101-2:229–236, 1987.

DEPARTAMENT D'ÀLGEBRA I GEOMETRIA
 FACULTAT DE MATEMÀTIQUES
 UNIVERSITAT DE BARCELONA
 GRAN VIA 585, 08007 BARCELONA, SPAIN
 E-mail address: `elias@mat.ub.es`